Mr HOBBES

Considered

In his { LOYALTY, / RELIGION, / REPUTATION, and / MANNERS.

By way of Letter to Dr *Wallis*.

LONDON,
Printed for *Andrew Crooke*, and are to be sold at his Shop, at the Sign of the *Green-Dragon* in St *Paul*'s Church-yard, 1662.

613. k. 9.45.
~~N-10.~~

THOSBES

Considered

In his
- LOYALTY,
- RELIGION,
- REPUTATION, and
- MANNERS.

By way of Letter to Dr. *Wallis*.

LONDON,
Printed for *Andrew Crooke*, and are
to be sold [illegible] at the Sign of the *Green-*
[illegible] in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1662.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

Sir,

I Am one of them that admire your Writings; and having read over your *Hobbius Heauton-timorumenos*, I cannot hold from giving you ſome account of the cauſes why I admire it: And firſt I conſidered how you handle him for his diſloyalty, in theſe words, *pag.* the 5th. *His great* Leviathan (*wherein he placed his main ſtrength*) *is now ſomewhat out of ſeaſon; which, upon deſerting his Royal Maſter in diſtreſs, (for he pretends to have been the Kings Tutor, though yet, from thoſe who have moſt reaſon to know it, I can find but little ground for ſuch a pretence,) was written in defence of* Oliver's *Title, (or whoever, by whatſoever*

means, can get to be upmoſt,) placing the whole right of Goverment meerly in ſtrength, and Abſolving all his Majeſties Subjects from their Allegiance, whenever He is not in a preſent capacity to force Obedience.

That which I obſerve and admire here firſt, is, That you left not this paſſage out, for two reaſons; One, becauſe Mr *Hobbes* could long for nothing more than ſuch an occaſion to tell the world his own and your little ſtories, during the time of the late Rebellion.

When the Parliament ſate, that began in *April* 1640. and was diſſolved in *May* following, and in which many points of the Regal Power, which were neceſſary for the Peace of the Kingdom, and the ſafety of His Majeſties Perſon, were diſputed and denied, Mr *Hobbes* wrote a little Treatiſe in Engliſh,

Engliſh, wherein he did ſet forth and demonſtrate, That the ſaid Power and Rights was inſeparably annexed to the Soveraignty; which Soveraignty they did not then deny to be in the King; but it ſeems underſtood not, or would not underſtand that Inſeparability. Of this Treatiſe, though not Printed, many Gentlemen had Copies, which occaſioned much talk of the Author; and had not His Majeſty diſſolved the Parliament, it had brought him into danger of his life.

He was the firſt that had ventured to write in the Kings defence, and one amongſt very few, that upon no other ground but knowledge of his duty, and Principles of Equity, without ſpecial Intereſt, was in all points perfectly Loyal.

The 3d of *November* following, there

there began a new Parliament, consisting for the greatest part of such men as the people had elected only for their adverseness to the Kings Interest. These proceeded so fiercely in the very beginning against those that had written or preach'd in the defence of any part of that Power, which they then intended to take away, and in gracing those whom the King had disgrac'd for sedition, that Mr *Hobbes* doubting how they would use him, went over into *France*, the first of all that fled, and there continued eleven years, to his dammage some thousands of pounds deep. This (Dr) was your time of harvest: You were in their favour, and that (as you have made it since appear) for no goodness.

Being at *Paris*, he wrote and published his Book *de Cive*, in Latine,

tine, to the end that all Nations wch ſhould hear what you and your Concovenanters were doing in *England*, might deteſt you, which I believe they do; for I know no Book more magnified than this is beyond the Seas.

When His Majeſty that now is came to *Paris*, Mr *Hobbes* had the honour to initiate him in the Mathematiques; but never was ſo impudent or ignorant as to call or think himſelf the Kings Tutor, as you (that underſtand not what that word, out of the Univerſity, ſignifies) do falſly charge him with; or ever to ſay, that he was one of His Majeſties domeſtique Servants. While upon this occaſion he ſtaid about *Paris*, and had neither encouragement nor deſire to return into *England*, he wrote and publiſhed his *Leviathan*, far from the

intention either of disadvantage to His Majesty, or to flatter *Oliver*, (who was not made Protector till three or four years after) or purpose to make way for his return: For there is scarce a page in it that does not upbraid both him, and you, and others such as you, with your abominable hypocrisie and villany.

Nor did he desert His Majesty, as you falsly accuse him, as His Majesty Himself knows. Nor was His Majesty (as you unmannerly term it) *in distress*. He had the Title, Right, and Reverence of a King, and maintained His faithful Servants with Him. It is true, that Mr *Hobbes* came home; but it was because he would not trust his safety with the French Clergy.

Do you know that ever he sought any benefit either from *Oliver*,

Oliver, or from any of his Party, or was any way familiar with any of his Miniſters, before or after his Return? or curried favour with any of them (as you did by Dedicating a Book to his Vice-Chancellor *Owen?*)

Did you ever hear that he took any thing done to him by His Majeſty in evil part, or ſpake of him otherwiſe than the beſt of His Servants would do, or that he was ſullen, ſilent, or ſparing, in praiſing His Majeſty in any company, upon any occaſion?

He knew who were his enemies, and upon what ground they miſconſtrued his writings.

But your indiſcretion appears more manifeſtly in giving him occaſion to repeat what you have done, and to *conſider* you, as you profeſſedly have conſidered him: For with

with what equity can it be denied him to repeat your manifeſt and horrible crimes, for all you have been pardoned; when you publiſh falſly pretended faults of his, and comprehended in the ſame pardon?

If he ſhould ſay, and publiſh, That you decyphered the Letters of the King and His Party, and thereby delivered his Majeſties ſecrets to the Enemy, and His beſt Friends to the Scaffold, and boaſted of it in your Book of Arithmetique (written in Latine) to all the world, as of a Monument of your Wit, worthy to be preſerved in the Univerſity Library: How will you juſtifie your ſelf, if you be reproached for having been a Rebel and a Traytor? It may be you, or ſome for you, will now ſay, You decyphered thoſe Letters to the Kings advantage: But then you were

were unfaithful to your Maſters of the Parliament : A very honeſt pretence, and full of gallantry, to excuſe *Treaſon* with *Treachery*, and to be a double Spy. Beſides, Who will believe it? Who enabled you to do the King that favour? Why hearded you with His Enemies? Who brought the King into a need of ſuch a fellows favour, but they that firſt deſerted him, and then made war upon him, and which were your friends, and Mr *Hobbes* his enemies. Nay more, I know not one enemy Mr *Hobbes* then had, but ſuch as were firſt the Kings enemies, and becauſe the Kings, therefore his. Your being of that Party, (without your decyphering,) amounts to more than a deſertion. Of the Biſhops that then were, and for whoſe ſakes (in part) you raiſed the War, there was not one

that

that followed the King out of the Land, though they loved him, but lived quietly under the Protection, first of the Parliament, and then of *Oliver*, (whose Titles and Actions were equally unjust,) without treachery. Is not this as bad as if they had gone over, and(which was Mr *Hobbes* his case) been driven back again? I hope you will not call them all desertors, or (because by their stay here openly they accepted of the *Parliaments* and of *Oliver's* Protection) defenders either of *Oliver's*, or of the *Parliaments* Title to the Soveraign Power.

How many were there in that Parliament at first that did indeed and voluntarily desert the King, in consenting to many of their unjust actions? Many of these afterwards, either upon better judgment, or

because

becauſe they pleaſed not the Faction, (for it was a hard matter for ſuch as were not of *Pymmes* Cabal to pleaſe the Parliament,) or for ſome other private ends, deſerted the Parliament, and did ſome of them more hurt to the King than if they had ſtaid where they were; (for they had been ſo affrighted by ſuch as you, with a panique fear of Tyranny, that ſeeking to help Him by way of compoſition and ſharing, they abated the juſt and neceſſary indignation of His Armies, by which only His Right was to be recovered.)

That very entring into the Covenant with the Scottiſh Nation againſt the King, is by it ſelf a very great Crime, and you guilty of it. And ſo was the impoſing of the Engagement, and you guilty of that alſo, as being done by the then

then Parliament, whoſe Democratical Principles you approved of.

You were alſo aſſiſting to the Reſemblance of Divines that made the *Directory*, and which were afterwards put down by *Oliver* for counterfeiting themſelves Embaſſadors. And this was when the King was living, and in the head of an Army, which with your own endeavour might have protected you. What crime it is (the King being Head of the Church of *England*) to make *Directories*, to alter the *Church-government*, and to ſet up new Formes of Gods Service, upon your own fancies, without the Kings Authority, the Lawyers could have told you; and what puniſhment you were to expect from it, you might have ſeen in the Statute printed before the Book of *Common Prayer*.

Further

Further he may ſay, and truly, That you were guilty of all the Treaſons, Murders, and Spoil committed by *Oliver*, or by any upon *Oliver*'s or the *Parliaments* Authority: For, during the late trouble, who made both *Oliver* and the people mad, but the Preachers of your Principles? But beſides the wickedneſs, ſee the folly of it. You thought to make them mad, but juſt to ſuch a degree as ſhould ſerve your own turn; that is to ſay, mad, and yet juſt as wiſe as your ſelves. Were you not very imprudent to think to govern madneſs? *Paul* they knew, but who were you? Who were they that put the Army into *Oliver*'s hands, (who before, as mad as he was, was too weak, and too obſcure to do any great miſchief) with which Army he executed upon ſuch as you, both

here

here and in *Scotland*, that which the juſtice of God required.

Therefore, of all the Crimes (the Great Crime not excepted) done in that Rebellion, you were guilty; you, I ſay, Dr *Wallis*, (how little force or wit ſoever you contributed) for your good will to their cauſe. The King was hunted as a Partridge in the Mountains; and though the Hounds have been hang'd, yet the Hunters were as guilty as they, and deſerved no leſs puniſhment. And the Decypherers, and all that blew the horn, are to be reckoned amongſt the Hunters. Perhaps you would not have had the prey killed, but rather have kept it tame. And yet who can tell? I have read of few Kings deprived of their Power by their own Subjects, that have lived any long time after it, for reaſons that every

every man is able to conjecture.

All this is ſo manifeſt as it needs no witneſſes. In the mean time Mr *Hobbes* his behaviour was ſuch, that of them who appeared in that Scene, he was the only man I know (except a few that had the ſame Principles with him) that has not ſomething more or leſs to bluſh for; as having either aſſiſted that rebellious Parliament, without neceſſity, (when they might have had Protection from the King, if they had reſorted to him for it in the field,) by Covenanting, or by Action, or with Money, or Plate, or by Voting againſt His Majeſties Intereſt, in Himſelf, or His friends; though ſome of them have ſince by extraordinary Service deſerved to be received into favour: But what's that to you? You are none of them; and yet you dare to reproach the

guiltleſs, as if after ſo ill fruits of your Sermons, it were not impudence enough to preach.

I admire further, That having been forgiven theſe ſo tranſcendent Crimes, (ſo great a debt to the Gallows) you take Mr *Hobbes* by the throat for a word in his *Leviathan*, made a fault by malicious or over-haſty conſtruction: For you have thereby, like the unmerciful debtor in the Goſpel, (in my opinion) forfeited your pardon, and ſo, without a new one, may be hanged yet.

To that other Charge, *That he writ his* Leviathan *in defence of* Olivers *Title*, he will ſay, That you in your own conſcience know it is falſe. What was *Oliver* when that Book came forth? It was in 1650. and Mr *Hobbes* returned before 1651. *Oliver* was then but General under

under your Maſters of the Parliament, nor had yet cheated them of their uſurped Power: For that was not done till two or three years after, in 1653. which neither he nor you could foreſee: What Title then of *Oliver*'s could he pretend to juſtifie? But you will ſay, He placed the right of Goverment there wherſoever ſhould be the ſtrength; and ſo by conſequence he placed it in *Oliver*. Is that all? Then primarily his *Leviathan* was intended for your Maſters of the Parliament, becauſe the ſtrength was then in them: Why did they not thank him for it, both they and *Oliver* in their turns? There (Doctor) you decypher'd ill: For it was written in the behalf of thoſe many and faithful Servants and Subjects of His Majeſty that had taken His part in the War, or otherwiſe done

their utmoſt endeavour to defend His Majeſties Right and Perſon againſt the Rebells; whereby, having no other means of Protection, nor (for the moſt part) of ſubſiſtence, were forced to compound with your Maſters, and to promiſe Obedience for the ſaving of their lives and fortunes, which in his Book he hath affirmed they might lawfully do, and conſequently not lawfully bear Arms againſt the Victors. They that had done their utmoſt endeavour to perform their obligation to the King, had done all that they could be obliged unto; and were conſequently at liberty to ſeek the ſafety of their lives and livelihood whereſoever, and without Treachery. But there is nothing in that Book to juſtifie the ſubmiſſion of you, (or ſuch as you) to the Parliament, after the Kings

Kings being driven from them, or to *Oliver*; for you were the Kings Enemies, and cannot pretend want of that Protection which you your ſelves refuſed, denied, fought againſt, and deſtroyed. If a man owe you money, and you by robbing him, or other injury, diſable him to pay you, the fault's your own; nor needs this exception, *Unleſs the Creditor rob him*, be put into the Condition of the Bond. Protection and Obedience are Relative. He that ſays a man may ſubmit to an enemy for want of Protection, can never be conſtrued, but that he meant it of the Obedient. But let us conſider his words. They are in *pag.* 390. Where he puts for a Law of Nature, *That every man is bound as much as in him lieth, to protect in warr the Authority by which he is himſelf protected*

in time of Peace; which I think is no ungodly nor unreaſonable Principle. For confirmation of it, he defines in what point of time it is, that a Subject becomes obliged to obey an unjuſt Conquerour: And defines it thus; *It is that point wherein having liberty to ſubmit to the Conquerour, he conſenteth either by expreſs words, or by other ſufficient ſignes, to be his Subject.*

I cannot ſee, Doctor, how a man can be at liberty to ſubmit to his new, that has not firſt done all he could for his old Maſter: Nor if he have done all he could, why that liberty ſhould be refuſed him. If a man be taken by the Turk, and brought by terrour to fight againſt his former Maſter, I ſee how he may be kill'd for it, as an enemy, but not as a Criminal: Nor can I ſee how he that hath liberty to ſubmit, can

at

at the ſame time be bound not to ſubmit.

But you will ſay, perhaps, That he defines the time of that liberty to the advantage of *Oliver*, in that he ſays that *for an ordinary Subject, it is then, when the means of his life are within the Guards and Garriſons of the Enemy; for it is then, that he hath no protection but from the Enemy, for his Contribution.* It was not neceſſary for him to explain it to men of ſo great underſtanding, that you and other his enemies pretend to be, by putting in the exception, *Unleſs they came into thoſe Guards and Garriſons by their own treaſon.* Do you think that *Oliver*'s Party, for their ſubmiſſion to *Oliver*, could pretend the want of that Protection?

The words therefore by themſelves, without that exception, do

ſignifie no more than this, *That whoſoever had done as much as in him did lye to protect the King in War, had liberty afterwards to provide themſelves of ſuch Protection as they could get*; which to thoſe whoſe means of life were within the Guards and Garriſons of *Oliver*, was *Oliver*'s Protection.

Do you think when a Battel is loſt, and you at the mercy of the Enemy, it is unlawful to receive Quarter with condition of Obedience? Or if you receive it on that condition, do you think it honeſty to break promiſe, and treacherouſly murder him that gave you your life? If that were good Doctrine, he were a fooliſh enemy that would give Quarter to any man.

You ſee then, that this ſubmiſſion to *Oliver*, or to your then Maſters, is allowed by Mr *Hobbes* his Doctrine

Doctrine only to the Kings faithful Party, and not to any that fought againſt him, howſoever they coloured it, by ſaying they fought for the King and Parliament; nor to any that writ or preached againſt His cauſe, or encouraged His Adverſaries; nor to any that betrayed His Counſels, or that intercepted or decyphered any Letters of His, or of His Officers, or of any of His Party; nor to any that by any way had contributed to the diminution of His Majeſties Power, Eccleſiaſtical or Civil; nor does it abſolve any of them from their Allegeance. You that make it ſo hainous a crime for a man to ſave himſelf from violent death, by a forc'd ſubmiſſion to an Uſurper, ſhould have conſidered what crime it was to ſubmit voluntarily to that Uſurping Parliament.

I can tell you beſides why thoſe words were put into his laſt Chapter, which he calls the Review. It happened at that time that there were many Honourable Perſons, that having been faithful and unblemiſhed Servants of the King, and Souldiers in His Army, had their Eſtates then Sequeſtred; of whom ſome were fled, but the fortunes of them all were at the mercy (not of *Oliver*, but) of the *Parliament*. Some of theſe were admitted to Compoſition, ſome not. They that Compounded, though they help'd the Parliament leſs by their Compoſition, than they ſhould have done (if they had ſtood out) by their Confiſcation, yet they were ill ſpoken of, eſpecially by thoſe that had no Eſtates to loſe, nor hope to Compound. And it was for this that he added

to

to what he had written before, this caution, That if they would compound, they were to do it *bona fide*, without intention of Treachery. Wherein he juſtified their Submiſſion by their former Obedience, and preſent Neceſſity; but condemned Treachery. Whereas you that pretend to abhor Atheiſm, condemn that which was done upon neceſſity, and juſtifie the Treachery: And you had reaſon for it, that cannot otherwiſe juſtifie your ſelves. Thoſe ſtruglings which happened afterwards, loſt His Majeſty many a good and able Subject, and ſtrengthened *Oliver* with the Confiſcation of their Eſtates, which if they had attended the diſcord of their Enemies, might have been ſaved.

Perhaps you will take for a ſign of Mr *Hobbes* his ill meaning, that

His

His Majeſty was diſpleaſed with him. And truly I believe He was diſpleaſed for a while, but not very long. They that complained of, and miſ-conſtrued his writings, were His Majeſties good Subjects, and reputed wiſe and learned men, and thereby obtained to have their miſ-conſtruction believed for ſome little time: But the very next Summer after his coming away, two Honourable Perſons of the Court that came over into *England*, aſſured him that His Majeſty had a good opinion of him; and others ſince have told me, that His Majeſty ſaid openly, That He thought Mr *Hobbes* never meant Him hurt. Beſides His Majeſty hath uſed him more graciouſly than is ordinary to ſo humble a perſon as he is, and ſo great a Delinquent as you would make him, and teſtified His eſteem

of

of him in His bounty. What Argument now can you draw from hence more than this, That His Majesty understood his writings better than his accusers did.

I admire in the next place, upon what ground you accuse him (and with him all those that have approved his *Leviathan*) with Atheism. I thought once, that that slander had had some (though not firm) ground in that you call his new Divinity: But for that point he will alledge these words of his *Leviathan*, pag. 238. *By which it seemeth to me (with submission nevertheless both in this and all other Questions, whereof the determination dependeth on the Scriptures, to the Interpretation of the Bible authorized by the Commonwealth, whose Subject I am,) That,* &c. What is there in these words but Modesty and Obedience? But you

you were at this time in actual Rebellion. Mr *Hobbes*, that holds Religion to be a Law, did in order thereto condemn the maintenance of any of his Opinions againſt the Law; and you that reproach him for them upon your own account, ſhould alſo have ſhewn by your own learning, wherein the Scripture, which was his ſole proof, was miſ-cited, or miſ-conſtrued by him; (for he ſubmitted to the Laws, that is to ſay, to the Kings Doctrine, not to yours;) and not have inſulted for the victory won by the power of the Law, to which you were then an enemy.

Another Argument of Atheiſm you take from his denying *immaterial*, or *incorporeal ſubſtances*. Let any man impartially now compare his Religion with yours, by this very meaſure, and judge which of

of the two ſavours moſt of Atheiſm.

It is by all Chriſtians confeſt, that God is *incomprehenſible*; that is to ſay, that there is nothing can ariſe in our fancy from the naming of him, to reſemble him either in *ſhape*, *colour*, *ſtature*, or *nature*; there is no Idea of him; he is like nothing that we can think on: What then ought we to ſay of him? What Attributes are to be given him, not ſpeaking otherwiſe than we think, nor otherwiſe than is fit, by thoſe who mean to honour him? None but ſuch as Mr *Hobbes* hath ſet down, namely, expreſſions of reverence, ſuch as are in uſe amongſt men for ſigns of Honour, and conſequently ſignifie *Goodneſs*, *Greatneſs*, and *Happineſs*; and either abſolutely put, as *Good*, *Holy*, *Mighty*, *Bleſſed*, *Juſt*, *Wiſe*, *Merciful*,

ful,&c. or *Superlative*,as *most Good*, *most Great*, *most Mighty*, *Almighty*, *most Holy*,&c. or Negative,of whatsoever is not perfect, as *Infinite*, *Eternal*, and the like: And not such as neither Reason nor Scripture hath approved for Honourable. This is the Doctrine that Mr *Hobbes* hath written, both in his *Leviathan*, and in his Book *de Cive*, and when occasion serves, maintains. What kind of Attribute I pray you is *immaterial*, or *incorporeal substance*? Where do you find it in the Scripture? Whence came it hither, but from *Plato* and *Aristotle* Heathens, who mistook those thin Inhabitants of the brain they see in sleep, for so many *incorporeal* men; and yet allow them motion, which is proper only to things *corporeal*? Do you think it an honour to God to be one of these? And

And would you learn Christianity from *Plato* and *Aristotle*? But seeing there is no such word in the Scripture, how will you warrant it from natural reason? Neither *Plato* nor *Aristotle* did ever write of, or mention an *incoporeal Spirit*; for they could not conceive how a Spirit, which in their language was πνεῦμα (in ours *a Wind*) could be *incorporeal*. Do you understand the connection of *substance* and *incorporeal*? If you do, explain it in English; for the words are Latine. It is something, you'l say, that being *without body*, *stands under*---. Stands under what? Will you say *under Accidents*? Almost all the Fathers of the Church will be against you; and then you are an Atheist. Is not Mr *Hobbes* his way of Attributing to God, that only which the Scriptures Attri-

bute to him, or what is never any where taken but for honour, much better than this bold undertaking of yours, to *conſider* and decypher Gods *nature* to us?

For a third Argument of Atheiſm you put, That he ſays, *Beſides the Creation of the World, there is no Argument to prove a Deity*; and, *That it cannot be evinced by any Argument that the World had a Beginning*; and, *That whether it had or no, is to be decided not by Argument, but by the Magiſtrates Authority.* That it may be decided by the Scriptures, he never denyed: Therefore in that alſo you ſlander him. And as for Arguments from natural Reaſon, neither you, nor any other have hitherto brought any (except the Creation) that has not made it more doubtful to many men than it was before. That

which

which he hath written concerning ſuch Arguments, is in his Book *De Corpore*. *Opinions* (ſaith he) *concerning the nature of* Infinite *and* Eternal, *as the chiefeſt of the fruits of Wiſedom, God hath reſerved to himſelf, and made Judges of them, thoſe men whoſe Miniſtery he meant to uſe in the ordering of* Religion; *and therefore I cannot praiſe thoſe men that brag of Demonſtration of the Beginning of the World from natural reaſon.* And again, *pag.* 238. *Wherefore I paſs by thoſe Queſtions of* Infinite *and* Eternal, *contenting my ſelf with ſuch Doctrine concerning the Beginning and Magnitude of the World, as I have learnt from the Scripture, confirmed by Miracles, and from the uſe of my Country, and from the Reverence I owe to the Law.* This, Doctor, is not ill ſaid, and yet 'tis all you ground your ſlander on,

which you make to ſneak vilely under a crooked Paraphraſe.

Theſe Opinions, I ſaid, were to be judged by thoſe to whom God has committed the ordering of Religion; that is, to the Supream Governors of the Church, that is, in *England*, to the King: By His Authority, I ſay, it ought to be decided, (not what men ſhall think, but) what they ſhall ſay in thoſe Queſtions. And me thinks you ſhould not dare to deny it; for it is a manifeſt relapſe into your former Crimes.

But why do you ſtile the King by the name of *Magiſtrate*? Do you find *Magiſtrate* to ſignifie any where the Perſon that hath the Soveraign Power, or not every where the Soveraigns Officers. And I think you knew that; but you and your fellows (your fellows I call all thoſe that

that are ſo beſmeared all over with the filth of the ſame Crime, as not to be diſtinguiſhed,) meant to make your Aſſembly the Soveraign, and the King your *Magiſtrate*. I pray God you do not mean ſo ſtill, if opportunity be preſented.

There has hitherto appeared in Mr *Hobbes* his Doctrine no ſigne of Atheiſm; and whatſoever can be inferr'd from the denying of *Incorporeal Subſtances*, makes *Tertullian*, one of the ancienteſt of the Fathers, and moſt of the Doctors of the Greek Church, as much Atheiſts as he: For *Tertullian* in his Treatiſe *De Carne Chriſti*, ſays plainly; *Omne quod eſt, corpus eſt ſui generis. Nihil eſt incorporale, niſi quod non eſt.* That is to ſay, *Whatſoever is any thing, is a body of its kind. Nothing is Incorporeal, but that which has no Being.* There are many o-

ther places in him to the ſame purpoſe: For that Doctrine ſerved his turn to confute the Hæreſie of them that held that Chriſt had no body, but was a *Ghoſt*: Alſo of the Soul he ſpeaks, as of an inviſible body. And there is an Epitome of the Doctrine of the Eaſtern Church, wherein is this, That they thought Angels and Souls were *Corporeal*, and only called *Incorporeal*, becauſe their bodies were not like ours. And I have heard that a Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, in a Council held there, did argue for the lawfulneſs of painting Angels, from this, that they were *Corporeal*. You ſee what fellows in Atheiſm you joyn with Mr *Hobbes*.

How unfaigned your own Religion is, may be argued ſtrongly, demonſtratively, from your behaviour that I have already recited.

Do

Do you think, you that have committed ſo abominable ſins, not through infirmity, or ſudden tranſport of Paſſion, but premeditately, wilfully, for twenty years together, that any rational man can think you believe your ſelves, when you preach of Heaven and Hell, or that you do not believe one another to be Cheaters and Impoſtors, and to laugh at ſilly people in your ſleeves for believing you; or that you applaud not your own wit for it; though for my part I could never concieve that very much wit was requiſite for the making of a knave. And in the Pulpit moſt of you have been a ſcandal to Chriſtianity, by preaching up ſedition, and crying down Moral virtue. You ſhould have preach'd againſt unjuſt *Ambition*, *Covetouſneſs*, *Gluttony*, *Malice*, *Diſobedience to Government*,

Fraud, and *Hypocriſie*: But for the moſt part you preach'd your own Controverſies, about who ſhould be uppermoſt, or other fruitleſs and unedifying Doctrines. When did any of you preach againſt *Hypocriſie*? You dare not in the Pulpit (I think) ſo much as name it, leſt you ſet the Church a laughing: And you in particular, when you ſaid in a Sermon, That *Sophos* was not in *Homer*; what edification could the people have from that, though it had been true, as 'tis falſe? (For it is in his *Iliade*, *lib.* 15. *verſ.* 363.) Another I heard make half his Sermon of this Doctrine, That *God never ſent a great Deliverance, but in a great Danger*: Which is indeed true, becauſe the greatneſs of the Danger makes the greatneſs of the Deliverance, but for the ſame cauſe ridiculous; and

the

the other half he took to construe the Greek of his Text: And yet such Sermons are much applauded. But why? First, Because they make not the people ashamed of any Vice. Secondly, Because they like the Preacher, for using to find fault with the Government or Governors. Thirdly, For their vehemence, which they mistake for Zeal. Fourthly, For their zeal to their own ends, which they mistake for zeal to Gods Worship. I have heard besides divers Sermons made by Phanatiques, young men, and whom by that, and their habit, I imagined to be Apprentices; and found little difference between their Sermons, and the Sermons of such as you, either in respect of Wisedom, or Eloquence, or Vehemence, or Applause of common people.

Therefore

Therefore I wonder how you can pretend (as you do in your Petition, for a Diſpenſation from the Ceremonies of the Church) to be either better Preachers than thoſe that Conform, or to have tenderer Conſciences than other men. You that have covered ſuch black deſigns with the Sacred words of Scripture, why can you not as well find in your hearts to cover a black Gown with a white Surplice? Or what Idolatry do you find in making the ſigne of the Croſs, when the Law commands it? Though I think you may conform without ſin, yet I think you might have been alſo diſpenſed with without ſin, if you had diſpenſed in like manner with other Miniſters that ſubſcribed to the Articles of the Church. And if tenderneſs of Conſcience be a good Plea, you

muſt

must give Mr *Hobbes* also leave to plead tenderness of Conscience to his new Divinity, as well as you. I should wonder also how any of you should dare to speak to a multitude met together, without being limited by His Majesty what they shall say, especially now that we have felt the smart of it, but that it is a relique of the Ecclesiastical policy of the Popes, that found it necessary for the dis-joyning of the people from their too close adherence to their Kings, or other Civil Governours.

But it may be you will say, That the rest of the Clergy, Bishops, and Episcopable men, no friends of yours, and against whose Office Mr *Hobbes* never writ any thing, speak no better of his Religion than you do.

'Tis true, he never wrote against Episcopacy;

Epiſcopacy; and it is his private opinion, That ſuch an Epiſcopacy as is now in *England*, is the moſt commodious that a Chriſtian King can uſe for the governing of Chriſts Flock, the miſgoverning whereof the King is to anſwer for to Chriſt, as the Biſhops are to anſwer for their miſ-goverment to the King, and to God alſo. Nor ever ſpake he ill of any of them, as to their perſons: Therefore I ſhould wonder the more at the uncharitable cenſure of ſome of them, but that I ſee a relique ſtill remaining of the venome of Popiſh Ambition, lurking in that ſeditious *diſtinction* and *diviſion* between the Power *Spiritual* and *Civil*, which they that are in love with a Power to hurt all thoſe that ſtand in competition with them for Learning (as the Roman Clergy had to hurt *Galileo*)

Galileo) do not willingly forſake. All Biſhops are not in every point like one another. Some it may be are content to hold their Authority from the Kings Letters Patents; and theſe have no cauſe to be angry with Mr *Hobbes*. Others will needs have ſomewhat more, they know not what, of Divine Right, to Govern by vertue of *Impoſition of Hands*, and *Conſecration*, not acknowledging their Power from the King, but immediatly from Chriſt. And theſe perhaps are they that are diſpleaſed with him, which he cannot help, nor has deſerved; but will for all that believe the King only, and without ſharers, to be the Head of all the Churches within His own Dominions; and that he may diſpence with Ceremonies, or with any thing elſe that is not againſt the Scriptures, nor againſt

natural

natural equity; and that the consent of the Lords and Commons cannot now give Him that Power, but declare for the people their advice and consent to it. Nor can he be made believe that the safety of a State depends upon the safety of the Church, I mean, of the Clergy: For neither is a Clergy essential to a Common-wealth; and those Ministers that preached sedition pretend to be of the Clergy, as well as the best. He believes rather that the safety of the Church depends on the safety of the King, and the entireness of the Soveraign Power; and that the King is no part of the Flock of any Minister or Bishop, no more than the Shepherd is of his Sheep, but of Christ only; and all the Clergy, as well as the people, the Kings Flock. Nor can that clamour of

his

his adverſaries make Mr *Hobbes* think himſelf a worſe Chriſtian than the beſt of them. And how will you diſprove it, either by his diſobedience to the Laws *Civil*, or *Eccleſiaſtical*, or by any ugly action? Or how will you prove that the obedience which ſprings from ſcorn of Injuſtice, is leſs acceptable to God, than that which proceeds from fear of puniſhment, or hope of benefit. Gravity and heavyneſs of countenance are not ſo good marks of aſſurance of Gods favour, as chearful, charitable, and upright behaviour towards men, which are better ſignes of Religion than the zealous maintaining of controverted Doctrines. And therefore I am verily perſwaded, it was not his Divinity that diſpleaſed you or them, but ſomewhat elſe, which you are not willing

ling to pretend. As for your party, that which angred you, I believe, was this paſſage of his *Leviathan*, pag. 89. *Whereas ſome men have pretended for their diſobedience to their Soveraign, a new Covenant made, not with men, but with God; this alſo is unjuſt: For there is no Covenant with God, but by mediation of ſome body that repreſenteth Gods Perſon; which none doth but Gods Lievtenant, who hath the Soveraignty under God: But this pretence of Covenant with God is ſo evident a lye* (this is it that angred you) *even in the pretenders own Conſciences, that it is not only an act of an unjuſt, but alſo of a vile and unmanly diſpoſition.*

Beſides his making the King Judge of Doctrines to be preach'd or publiſhed, hath offended you both; ſo has alſo his Atttributing

to

to the Civil Soveraign all Power *Sacerdotal*. But this perhaps may ſeem hard when the Soveraignty is in a Queen: But it is becauſe you are not ſubtile enough to perceive, that though *Man* be *male* and *female*, *Authority* is not. To pleaſe neither party is eaſie; but to pleaſe both, unleſs you could better agree amongſt your ſelves than you do, is impoſſible. Your differences have troubled the Kingdom, as if you were the Houſes revived of *York* and *Lancaſter*. A man would wonder how a little *Latine* and *Greek* ſhould work ſo mightily, when the Scriptures are in *Engliſh*, as that the King and Parliament can hardly keep you quiet, eſpecially in time of danger from abroad. If you will needs quarrel, decide it amongſt your ſelves, and draw not the people into your parties.

You were angry alſo for his blaming the Scholaſtical Philoſophers, and denying ſuch fine things as theſe, *That the* Species *or* Apparences *of Bodies come from the thing we look on, into the Eye, and ſo make us ſee; and into the Underſtanding, to make us underſtand; and into the Memory, to make us remember. That a Body may be juſt the ſame it was, and yet bigger or leſſer. That* Eternity *is a permanent Now*; and the like. *And for detecting, further than you thought fit, the fraud of the Roman Clergy.* Your diſlike of his Divinity was the leaſt cauſe of your calling him Atheiſt. But no more of this now.

The next head of your Contumelies is to make him contemptible, and to move Mr *Boyle* to pitty him. This is a way of railing too much beaten to be thought *Witty*.

As for the thing it ſelf, I doubt your Intelligence is not good, and that you Algebricians, and Non-conformiſts do but fain it to comfort one another. For your own part you contemn him not, or elſe you did very fooliſhly to Entitle the beginning of your Book Mr *Hobbes conſidered*, which argues he is conſiderable enough to you. Beſides, 'tis no Argument of contempt to ſpend upon him ſo many angry lines as would have furniſht you with a dozen of Sermons: If you had in good earneſt deſpiſed him, you would have let him alone, as he does Dr *Ward*, Mr *Baxter*, *Pike*, and others, that have reviled him as you do. As for his reputation beyond the Seas, it fades not yet: And becauſe perhaps you have no means to know it, I will cite you a paſſage of an Epiſtle written by a

Learned Frenchman to an eminent Perſon in *France*, a paſſage not impertinent to the point now in queſtion. It is in a Volume of Epiſtles, the fourth in order, and the words, *pag.* 167. concerning Chymiſts, are theſe; *Truly Sir, as much as I admire them, when I ſee them lute an Alembick handſomely, philter a Liquor, build an Athanor, ſo much I miſlike them when I hear them diſcourſe upon the Subject of their Operations; and yet they think all they do is nothing in reſpect of what they ſay: I wiſh they would take leſs pains, and be at leſs charges; and whilſt they waſh their hands after their work, they would leave to thoſe that attend to the poliſhing of their d ſcourſe, I mean the* Galileo's, *the* Deſcarteſes, *the* Hobbeſes, *the* Bacons, *and the* Gaſſendi's, *to reaſon upon their work, and themſelves to hear*

hear what the Learned and Judicious ſhall tell them, ſuch as are uſed to diſcern the differences of things. Quam ſcit uterque libens cenſebo exerceat artem. And more to the ſame purpoſe.

What is here ſaid of Chymiſts, is applicable to all other Mechaniques.

Every man that hath ſpare money can get Furnaces, and buy coals. Every man that hath ſpare money can be at the charge of making great Moulds, and hiring Workmen to grind their Glaſſes, and ſo may have the beſt and greateſt Teleſcopes: They can get Engines made, and apply them to the Stars; Recipients made, and try coucluſions; but they are never the more Philoſophers for all this. 'Tis laudable, I confeſs, to beſtow money upon curious or uſeful de-

lights; but that is none of the praiſes of a Philoſopher. And yet, becauſe the multitude cannot judge, they will paſs with the unskilful, for skilful in all parts of natural Philoſophy. And I hear now that *Hugenius* and *Euſtachio Divini* are to be tried by their Glaſſes, who is the more skilful in *Optiques* of the two; but for my part, before Mr *Hobbes* his Book *De Homine* came forth, I never ſaw any thing written of that ſubject intelligibly. Do not you tell me now, according to your wonted ingenuity, that I never ſaw *Euclid*'s, *Vitellio*'s, and many other men *Optiques*, as if I could not diſtinguiſh between *Geometry* and *Optiques*.

So alſo of all other Arts; not every one that brings from beyond Sea a new Gin, or other janty device, is therefore a Philoſopher:

For

For if you reckon that way, not only Apothecaries and Gardeners, but many other ſorts of workmen, will put in for, and get the Prize. Then, when I ſee the Gentlemen of *Greſham* Colledg apply themſelves to the Doctrine of Motion, (as Mr *Hobbes* has done, and will be ready to help them in it, if they pleaſe, and ſo long as they uſe him civilly,) I will look to know ſome Cauſes of natural Events from them, and their Regiſter, and not before: For Nature does nothing but by Motion.

I hear that the reaſon given by Mr *Hobbes*, why the drop of Glaſs ſo much wondred at, ſhivers into ſo many pieces, by breaking only one ſmall part of it, is approved for probable, and Regiſtred in their Colledg: But he has no reaſon to take it for a favour, becauſe

hereafter the Invention may be taken by that means not for his, but theirs.

To the reſt of your calumnies the Anſwers will be ſhort, and ſuch as you might eaſily have foreſeen. And firſt, for his boaſting of his Learning, it is well ſumm'd up by you in theſe words; *'Twas a motion made by one (whom I will not name) that ſome idle perſon ſhould read over all his Books, and collecting together his arrogant and ſupercilious ſpeeches, applauding himſelf, and deſpiſing all other men, ſet them forth in one Synopſis, with this Title,* Hobbius de ſe. *What a pretty piece of Pageantry this would make, I ſhall leave to your own thoughts.*

Thus ſay you: Now ſays Mr *Hobbes*, or I for him, Let your idle Perſon do it, and ſet down no more than he has witten, (as high praiſes

as

as they be) I'le promiſe you he ſhall acknowledg them under his hand, and be commended for it, and you ſcorned. A certain Roman Senator, having propounded ſomething in the Aſſembly of the People, which they miſliking made a noiſe at, boldly bad them hold their peace, and told them he knew better what was good for the Common-wealth than all they :- And his words are tranſmitted to us as an Argument of his Virtue; So much do Truth and Vanity alter the complection of ſelf-praiſe. Beſides, you can have very little skill in Morality, that cannot ſee the Juſtice of commending a mans ſelf, as well as of any thing elſe, in his own defence : And it was want of prudence in you, to conſtrain him to a thing that would ſo much diſpleaſe you. That part of his ſelf-

praiſe

praiſe which moſt offends you is in the end of his *Leviathan*, in theſe words; *Therefore I think it may be profitably printed, and more profitably taught in the Univerſities; in caſe they alſo think ſo, to whom the judgment of the ſame belongeth.* Let any man conſider the truth of it. Where did thoſe Miniſters learn their ſeditious Doctrine, and to preach it, but there? Where therefore ſhould Preachers learn to teach Loyalty, but there? And if your Principles produced Civil War, muſt not the contrary Principles, which are his, produce Peace? And conſequently his Book, as far as it handles Civil Doctrine, deſerves to be taught there: But when can this be done? When you ſhall have no longer an Army ready to maintain the evil Doctrine wherewith you have infected the people.

people. By a ready Army I mean Arms, and Money, and men enough, though not yet in pay, and put under Officers, yet gathered together in one place or City, to be put under Officers, armed, and payed on any sudden occasion; such as are the people of a great and populous Town. Every great City is as a standing Army, which if it be not under the Soveraigns command, the people are miserable; if they be, they may be taught their duties in the Universities safely & easily, and be happy. I never read of any Christian King that was a Tyrant, though the best of Kings have been call'd so.

Then for the *Morosity* and *Peevishness* you charge him with, all that know him familiarly, know 'tis a false accusation. But you mean, it may be, only towards those that argue against his Opinion: But neither

neither is that true. When vain and ignorant young Schollars, unknown to him before, come to him on purpoſe to argue with him, and to extort applauſe for their fooliſh Opinions, and miſſing of their end, fall into undiſcreet and uncivil expreſſions, and he then appear not very well contented, 'tis not his *Moroſity*, but their *Vanity* that ſhould be blamed. But what humor (if not Moroſity and Peeviſhneſs) was that of yours, whom he never had injured, or ſeen, or heard of, to uſe toward him ſuch inſolent, injurious, and clowniſh words, as you did in your abſurd *Elenchus*?

Was it not impatience of ſeeing any diſſent from you in opinion? Mr *Hobbes* has been alwaies far from provoking any man, though when he is provok'd, you find his pen as ſharp as yours.

Again,

Again, when you make his Age a reproach to him, and ſhew no cauſe that might impair the faculties of his mind but only Age, I admire how you ſaw not that you reproached all old men in the world as much as him, and warranted all young men, at a certain time, which they themſelves ſhall define, to call you *fool*. Your diſlike of old age you have alſo otherwiſe ſufficiently ſignified, in venturing ſo fairly as you have done to eſcape it. But that is no great matter to one that hath ſo many marks upon him of much greater reproaches. By Mr *Hobbes* his Calculation, that derives Prudence from Experience, and Experience from Age, you are a very young man; but by your own reckoning, you are older already then *Methuſelah*.

Laſtly, Who told you that he

writ

writ againſt Mr *Boyle*, whom in his writing he never mentioned? And that it was becauſe Mr *Boyle* was acquainted with you? I know the contrary. I have heard him wiſh it had been ſome perſon of lower condition that had been the Author of the Doctrine which he oppoſed, and therefore oppoſed becauſe it was falſe, and becauſe his own could not otherwiſe be defended. But thus much I think is true, that he thought never the better of his Judgment, for miſtaking you for Learned. This is all I thought fit to anſwer for him & his manners. The reſt is of his Geometry and Philoſophy, concerning which I ſay only this, That there is too much in your Book to be confuted: Almoſt every line may be diſproved, or ought to be reprehended. In ſum, it is all Errour and Railing, that is,

ſtinking

ſtinking wind, ſuch as a Jade lets fly when he is two hard guirt upon a full belly. I have done. I have conſidered you now, but will not again, whatſoever preferment any of your friends ſhall procure you.

FINIS.